

GEOMETRY IN URYSOHN'S UNIVERSAL METRIC SPACE

JULIEN MELLERAY

ABSTRACT. In recent years, much interest was devoted to the Urysohn space and its isometry group; this paper is a contribution to this field of research. We mostly concern ourselves with the properties of isometries of $\mathbb{U}$, showing for instance that any Polish metric space is isometric to the set of fixed points of some isometry φ . We conclude the paper by studying a question of Urysohn, proving that compact homogeneity is the strongest homogeneity property possible in $\mathbb{U}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

In a paper published posthumously (see [10]), P.S Urysohn constructed a complete separable metric space $\mathbb{U}$ that is *universal*, i.e contains an isometric copy of every complete separable metric space. This seems to have been forgotten for a while, perhaps because around the same time Banach and Mazur proved that $\mathcal{C}([0, 1])$ is also universal.

Yet, the interest of the Urysohn space $\mathbb{U}$ does not lie in its universality alone: as Urysohn himself had remarked, $\mathbb{U}$ is also *ω -homogeneous*, i.e for any two finite subsets A, B of $\mathbb{U}$ which are isometric (as abstract metric spaces), there exists an isometry φ of $\mathbb{U}$ such that $\varphi(A) = B$. Moreover, Urysohn proved that $\mathbb{U}$ is, up to isometry, the only universal ω -homogeneous Polish metric space.

In the case of Polish metric spaces, it turns out that universality and ω -homogeneity can be merged in one property, called *finite injectivity*: a metric space (X, d) is finitely injective iff for any pair of finite metric spaces $K \subseteq L$ and any isometric embedding $\varphi: K \rightarrow X$, there exists an isometric embedding $\tilde{\varphi}: L \rightarrow X$ such that $\tilde{\varphi}|_K = \varphi$.

Then one can prove that a Polish metric space is universal and ω -homogeneous if, and only if, it is finitely injective; this is also due to Urysohn, who was the first to use finite injectivity (using another definition of it).¹

This point of view highlights the parallel between $\mathbb{U}$ and other universal objects, such as the universal graph for instance; the interested reader

MSC: 51F99.

¹About finite injectivity, Urysohn stated in [10] "Voici la propriété fondamentale de l'espace $\mathbb{U}$ dont, malgré son caractère auxiliaire, les autres propriétés de cet espace sont des conséquences plus ou moins immédiates".

can find a more detailed exposition of this and references in [2].

The interest in $\mathbb{U}$ was revived in 1986 when Katětov, while working on analogues of the Urysohn space for metric spaces of a given density character, gave in [6] a new construction of $\mathbb{U}$, which enables one to naturally "build" an isometric copy of $\mathbb{U}$ "around" any separable metric space X . In [11] Uspenskij remarked that this construction (which we will detail a bit more in section 2) enables one to keep track of the isometries of X , and used that to obtain a canonical continuous embedding of the group of isometries of X into $Iso(\mathbb{U})$, the group of isometries of $\mathbb{U}$ (both groups being endowed with the product topology, which turns $Iso(\mathbb{U})$ into a Polish group). Since any Polish group G continuously embeds in the isometry group of some Polish space X , this shows that any Polish group is isomorphic to a (necessarily closed) subgroup of $Iso(\mathbb{U})$.

This result spurred interest for the study of $\mathbb{U}$; in [14], Vershik showed that generically (for a natural Polish topology on the sets of distances on $\mathbb{N}$) the completion of a countable metric space is finitely injective, and thus isometric to $\mathbb{U}$; in [13] Uspenskij completely characterized the topology of $\mathbb{U}$ by showing, using Toruńczyk's criterion, that $\mathbb{U}$ is homeomorphic to $l^2(\mathbb{N})$.

During the same period, Gao and Kechris used $\mathbb{U}$ to study the complexity of the equivalence relation of isometry between certain classes of Polish metric spaces (viewed as elements of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{U})$). For instance, they proved that the relation of isometry between Polish metric spaces is Borel bi-reducible to the translation action of $Iso(\mathbb{U})$ on $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{U})$, given by $\varphi.F = \varphi(F)$, and that this relation is universal among relations induced by a continuous action of a Polish group (see [3] for a detailed exposition of their results and references about the theory of Borel equivalence relations).

Despite all the recent interest in $\mathbb{U}$, not much work has yet been done on its geometric properties, with the exception of [2], where the authors build interesting examples of subgroups of $Iso(\mathbb{U})$.

As Urysohn himself had understood, finite injectivity has remarkable consequences on the geometry of $\mathbb{U}$, some of which we study in section 3; we begin with the easy fact that any isometry map which coincides with $id_{\mathbb{U}}$ on a set of non-empty interior must actually be $id_{\mathbb{U}}$. We then go on to study a bit the isometric copies of $\mathbb{U}$ contained in $\mathbb{U}$, e.g we show that $\mathbb{U}$ is isometric to $\mathbb{U} \setminus B$, where B is any open ball in $\mathbb{U}$.

We also use similar ideas to study the sets of fixed points of isometries, proving in particular that any Polish metric space is isometric to the set of fixed points of some isometry of $\mathbb{U}$.

The remainder of the article is devoted to the study of a question of

Urysohn, who asked in [10] whether $\mathbb{U}$ had stronger homogeneity properties than ω -homogeneity²; we build on known results to solve that problem. Most importantly, we use the tools introduced by Katětov in [6]. Let us state precisely the problems we concern ourselves with:

Question 1. Characterize the Polish metric spaces (X, d) such that whenever $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ are isometric to X , there is an isometry φ of $\mathbb{U}$ such that $\varphi(X_1) = X_2$.

As it turns out, we will not directly study that question, but another related one, which can be thought of as looking if one can extend finite injectivity:

Question 2 Characterize the Polish metric spaces (X, d) such that, whenever $X' \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ is isometric to X and $f \in E(X')$, there is $z \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\forall x \in X', d(x, z) = f(x)$.
($E(X)$ denotes the set of Katětov maps on X).

It is rather simple, as we will see in section 4, to show that Property 1 implies Property 2, and it is a well-known fact (see [5] or [4]) that the answer to both questions is positive whenever X is compact:

Theorem 1.1. (*Huhunaišvili*) *If $K \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ is compact and $f \in E(K)$, then there is $z \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $d(z, x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in K$.*

Corollary 1.2. *If $K, L \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ are compact and $\varphi: K \rightarrow L$ is an isometry, then there is an isometry $\tilde{\varphi}: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ such that $\tilde{\varphi}|_K = \varphi$.*

The corollary is deduced from the theorem by the standard back-and-forth method (So, in that case, a positive answer to question 2 enables one to answer positively question 1; we will see that it is actually always the case).

Remarking that if X is such that $E(X)$ is not separable then X can have neither property (1) nor property (2), we provide a characterization of the spaces X such that $E(X)$ is separable, which we tentatively call *compactly tentacular spaces*, for reasons that should be explained in a later version of the paper. Afterwards, we show that, if X is not compact and is compactly tentacular then X does not have property 2 either.

Therefore, our results enable us to deduce that a space has property 1 (or 2) if, and only if, it is compact, thus answering Urysohn's question: compact homogeneity is the strongest homogeneity property possible in $\mathbb{U}$.

²"On demandera, peut-être, si l'espace $\mathbb{U}$ ne jouit pas d'une propriété d'homogénéité plus précise que celle que nous avons indiquée au n. 14".

Acknowledgements. I would not have written this article if not for many conversations with Thierry Monteil; he introduced me to the Urysohn space, and the results in section 3 are answers to questions we asked during these conversations. I have learnt much from these talks, and for that I am extremely grateful; the results in section 3 are partly his. I also would like to seize the opportunity to thank Vladimir Pestov, whose kindness, disponibility and insights while at the CIRM in september 2004 were much appreciated; and Alekos Kechris, for numerous remarks and suggestions. Last (but not least of course), I would like to thank all those at the Equipe d'Analyse Fonctionnelle of the Université Paris 6, especially the members of the descriptive set theory workgroup, for providing me with such a nice environment to work in.

2. NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

If (X, d) is a complete separable metric space, we say that it is a *Polish metric space*, and often write it simply X .

If X is a topological space and there is a distance d on X which induces the topology of X and is such that (X, d) is a Polish metric space, we say that the topology of X is Polish.

If (X, d) is a metric space, $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, we use the notation $B(x, r[$ (resp. $B(x, r]$) to denote the open (resp. closed) ball of center x and radius r ; $S(x, r)$ denotes the sphere of center x and radius r .

To avoid confusions, we say, if (X, d) and (X', d') are two metric spaces and f is a map from X into X' , that f is an *isometric map* if $d(x, y) = d'(f(x), f(y))$ for all $x, y \in X$. If additionally f is onto, then we say that f is an *isometry*.

A *Polish group* is a topological group whose topology is Polish; if X is a separable metric space, then we denote its isometry group by $Iso(X)$, and endow it with the product topology, which turns it into a second countable topological group, and into a Polish group if X is Polish (see [1] or [7] for a thorough introduction to the theory of Polish groups).

Let (X, d) be a metric space; we say that $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *Katětov map* if

$$\forall x, y \in X \quad |f(x) - f(y)| \leq d(x, y) \leq f(x) + f(y) \quad .$$

These maps correspond to one-point metric extensions of X . We denote by $E(X)$ the set of all Katětov maps on X ; we endow it with the sup-metric, which turns it into a complete metric space.

That definition was introduced by Katětov in [6], and it turns out to be pertinent to the study of finitely injective spaces, since one can easily see by induction that a non-empty metric space X is finitely injective if, and only if,

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \quad \forall f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}) \quad \exists z \in X \quad \forall x \in X \quad d(z, x) = f(x) \quad .$$

(This is the form under which Urysohn used finite injectivity in his original article).

If $Y \subseteq X$ and $f \in E(Y)$, define $k(f): X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (the Katětov extension of f) by

$$k(f)(x) = \inf\{f(y) + d(x, y) : y \in Y\}.$$

Then $k(f)$ is the greatest 1-Lipschitz map on X which is equal to f on Y ; one checks easily (see for instance [6]) that $k(f) \in E(X)$ and $f \mapsto k(f)$ is an isometric embedding of $E(Y)$ into $E(X)$.

To simplify future definitions, if $f \in E(X)$ and $S \subseteq X$ are such that $f(x) = \inf\{f(s) + d(x, s) : s \in S\}$ for all $x \in X$, we say that S is a *support of f* , or that S *controls f* .

Notice that if S controls $f \in E(X)$ and $S \subseteq T$, then T controls f .

Similarly, X isometrically embeds in $E(X)$ via the Kuratowski map $x \mapsto f_x$, where $f_x(y) = d(x, y)$. A crucial fact for our purposes is that

$$\forall f \in E(X) \forall x \in X \ d(f, f_x) = f(x).$$

Thus, if one identifies X to a subset of $E(X)$ via the Kuratowski map, $E(X)$ is a metric space containing X and such that all one-point metric extensions of X embed isometrically in $E(X)$.

We now go on to sketching Katětov's construction of $\mathbb{U}$; we refer the reader to [3], [4], [6] or [11] for a more detailed presentation and proofs of the results we will use below.

Most important for the construction is the following

Theorem 2.1. (*Urysohn*) *If X is a finitely injective metric space, then the completion of X is also finitely injective.*

Since $\mathbb{U}$ is, up to isometry, the unique finitely injective Polish metric space, this proves that the completion of any separable finitely injective metric space is isometric to $\mathbb{U}$.

The basic idea of Katětov's construction works like this: if one lets $X_0 = X$, $X_{i+1} = E(X_i)$ then, identifying each X_i to a subset of X_{i+1} via the Kuratowski map, let Y be the inductive limit of the sequence X_i .

The definition of Y makes it clear that Y is finitely injective, since any $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq Y$ must be contained in some X_m , so that for any $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$ there exists $z \in X_{m+1}$ such that $d(z, x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all i .

Thus, if Y were separable, its completion would be isometric to $\mathbb{U}$, and one would have obtained an isometric embedding of X into $\mathbb{U}$.

The problem is that $E(X)$ is in general not separable (see section 4).

At each step, we have added too many functions; define then

$$E(X, \omega) = \{f \in E(X) : f \text{ is controlled by some finite } S \subseteq X\}.$$

Then $E(X, \omega)$ is easily seen to be separable if X is, and the Kuratowski map actually maps X into $E(X, \omega)$, since each f_x is controlled by $\{x\}$. Notice also that, if $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq X$ and $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$, then its Katětov extension $k(f)$ is in $E(X, \omega)$, and $d(k(f), f_{x_i}) = f(x_i)$ for all i .

Thus, if one defines this time $X_0 = X$, $X_{i+1} = E(X_i, \omega)$, and assume again that $X_i \subseteq X_{i+1}$ then $Y = \cup X_i$ is separable and finitely injective, hence its completion Z is isometric to $\mathbb{U}$, and $X \subseteq Z$.

The most interesting property of this construction is that it enables one to keep track of the isometries of X : indeed, any $\varphi \in Iso(X)$ is the restriction of a unique isometry $\tilde{\varphi}$ of $E(X, \omega)$, and the mapping $\varphi \mapsto \tilde{\varphi}$ from $Iso(X)$ into $Iso(E(X, \omega))$ is a continuous group embedding (see [6]).

That way, we obtain for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ continuous embeddings $\Psi^i: Iso(X) \rightarrow Iso(X_i)$, such that $\Psi^{i+1}(\varphi)|_{X_i} = \Psi^i(\varphi)$ for all i and all $\varphi \in Iso(X)$.

This in turns defines a continuous embedding from $Iso(X)$ into $Iso(Y)$, and since extension of isometries defines a continuous embedding from the isometry group of any metric space into that of its completion (see [12]), we actually have a continuous embedding of $Iso(X)$ into the isometry group of Z , that is to say $Iso(\mathbb{U})$ (and the image of any $\varphi \in Iso(X)$ is actually an extension of φ to $\mathbb{U}$).

In the remainder of the text, we follow [9] and say that a metric space X is *g-embedded* in $\mathbb{U}$ if X is embedded in $\mathbb{U}$, and there is a continuous morphism $\Phi: Iso(X) \rightarrow Iso(\mathbb{U})$ such that $\Phi(\varphi)$ extends φ for all $\varphi \in Iso(X)$.

3. FINITE INJECTIVITY AND THE GEOMETRY OF $\mathbb{U}$

3.1. First results.

The following result, tough easy to prove, is worth stating on its own, since it gives a good idea of the kind of problems we concern ourselves with in this section:

Theorem 3.1. *If $\varphi: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ is an isometric map, and $\varphi|_{B(0,1]} = id_{B(0,1]}$, then $\varphi = id_{\mathbb{U}}$.*

Proof. Say that $A \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ is a *set of uniqueness* iff

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{U} \left((\forall z \in A \ d(x, z) = d(y, z)) \Rightarrow x = y \right).$$

To prove theorem 3.1, we only need to prove that nonempty balls of $\mathbb{U}$ are sets of uniqueness: indeed, admit this for a moment and suppose that $\varphi: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ is an isometric map such that $\varphi|_{B(0,1]} = id_{B(0,1]}$.

Let then $x \in \mathbb{U}$: we have $d(x, z) = d(\varphi(x), \varphi(z)) = d(\varphi(x), z)$ for all

$z \in B(0, 1]$, so that $\varphi(x) = x$, and we are done. $\diamond$

Of course, if $A \subset B$ and A is a set of uniqueness, then B is one too; therefore, the following proposition is more than what is needed to prove theorem 3.1:

Proposition 3.2. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{U}$; say that $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$ is nice if*

$$\forall i \neq j \ |f(x_i) - f(x_j)| < d(x_i, x_j) \text{ and } f(x_i) + f(x_j) > d(x_i, x_j) .$$

Then, if f is nice, $K = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{z \in \mathbb{U} : \forall i \ d(z, x_i) = f(x_i)\}$ is a set of uniqueness.

Proof of Proposition 3.2.

Let $x \neq y \in \mathbb{U}$; we want to prove that there is some $z \in K$ such that $d(x, z) \neq d(y, z)$.

We may of course assume that $d(x, x_i) = d(y, x_i)$ for all i . Let now $g \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{x\} \cup \{y\})$ be the Katětov extension of f ; notice that $g(x) = g(y)$.

Now, pick $\alpha > 0$ and define a map g_α by:

- $g_\alpha(x_i) = g(x_i)$ for all i ,
- $g_\alpha(y) = g(y)$, and $g_\alpha(x) = g(x) - \alpha$.

Our hypothesis on f ensures that, if $\alpha > 0$ is small enough, then $g_\alpha \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{x\} \cup \{y\})$.

Hence there is some $z \in \mathbb{U}$ which has the prescribed distances to $x_1, \dots, x_n, x, y$, so that $z \in K$ and $d(z, x) \neq d(z, y)$. $\diamond$

Remark: Geometrically, this means that if $S_1, \dots, S_n$ are spheres of center $x_1, \dots, x_n$, no two of which are tangent (inwardly or outwardly), and $\cap S_i \neq \emptyset$, then $\cap S_i \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a set of uniqueness.

One may also notice that actually any nonempty sphere is a set of uniqueness.

Other examples of sets of uniqueness include the sets $Med(a, b) \cup \{a, b\}$, where $Med(a, b) = \{z \in \mathbb{U} : d(z, a) = d(z, b)\}$ (the proof is similar to the one above); in fact $Med(a, b) \cup \{a\}$ is a set of uniqueness, whereas $Med(a, b)$ obviously is not!

Also, one may wonder whether the condition in the statement of Proposition 3.2 is necessary; to see that one needs a condition of that kind, consider the following example: let x_0, x_1 be any two points such that $d(x_0, x_1) = 1$, and let f be defined by $f(x_1) = 1$, $f(x_2) = 2$. Then, for any point x such that $d(x, x_0) = d(x, x_1) = \frac{1}{2}$, one necessarily has $f(x) = \frac{3}{2}$, which proves that the result of Proposition 3.2 is not true in that case.

Theorem 3.1 shows that elements of $Iso(\mathbb{U})$ have some regularity properties; in particular, if an isometric map φ coincides on an open ball with an isometry ψ , then actually $\varphi = \psi$. One might then wonder, if $\varphi, \psi: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ are two isometric maps such that $\varphi|_B = \psi|_B$ for a nonempty ball B , whether one must have $\varphi = \psi$.

It is easy to see that this is the case if $\varphi(B) = \psi(B)$ is a set of uniqueness; on the other hand, it is not true in general, which is the content of the next proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *There are two isometric maps $\varphi, \psi: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ such that $\varphi(x) = \psi(x)$ for all $x \in B(0, 1]$, and $\varphi(\mathbb{U}) \cap \psi(\mathbb{U}) = \varphi(B(0, 1]) = \psi(B(0, 1])$.*

Proof.

This result is a consequence of the universality of $\mathbb{U}$: let X denote the metric amalgam of two copies of $\mathbb{U}$ (say, X_1 and X_2) over $B(0, 1]$, and let φ_0 be an isometry of $X = X_1 \cup X_2$ such that $\varphi_0(X_1) = X_2$, $\varphi_0^2 = id$ and $\varphi_0(x) = x$ for all $x \in B(0, 1]$.

Pick an isometric embedding $\varphi_1: X \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$, and let $y_0 = \varphi_1(0)$; also, let η be an isometry from $\mathbb{U}$ onto X_1 , and let $x_0 = \eta^{-1}(0)$.

Now let $\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \eta$, and $\psi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_0 \circ \eta$; by definition of φ_0 , φ and ψ are equal on $\eta^{-1}(B(0, 1]) = B(x_0, 1]$.

Also, one has that

$$\varphi(\mathbb{U}) = \varphi_1(X_1) \text{ and } \psi(\mathbb{U}) = \varphi_1(X_2), \text{ so } \varphi(\mathbb{U}) \cap \psi(\mathbb{U}) = \varphi_1(X_1 \cap X_2) = \varphi_1(B(0, 1]) = \varphi(B(x_0, 1]) = \psi(B(x_0, 1]) . \quad \diamond$$

In a way, the preceding proposition illustrates the fact that $\mathbb{U}$ contains many non-trivial isometric copies of itself (other examples include the sets $Med(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \{z \in \mathbb{U} : \forall i, j \, d(z, x_i) = d(z, x_j)\}$).

Still, all the isometric copies of $\mathbb{U}$ which we have seen so far are of empty interior. The next theorem (the proof of which is based on an idea of Pestov) shows that this is not always the case:

Theorem 3.4. *If $X \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ is closed and Heine-Borel (with the induced metric), $M > 0$, then $\{z \in \mathbb{U} : d(z, X) \geq M\}$ is isometric to $\mathbb{U}$.*

(Recall that a Polish metric space X is *Heine-Borel* iff closed bounded balls in X are compact).

In particular, $\mathbb{U}$ and $\mathbb{U} \setminus B(0, 1[$ are isometric.

Proof of Theorem 3.4.

We will first prove the result supposing that X is compact.

Define then $Y = \{z \in \mathbb{U} : d(z, X) \geq M\}$; Y is a closed subset of $\mathbb{U}$, so to show that it is isometric to $\mathbb{U}$ we only need to prove that Y is finitely injective.

Let $y_1, \dots, y_n \in Y$ and $f \in E(\{y_1, \dots, y_n\})$. Then there exists a point $c \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $d(c, y_i) = f(y_i)$ for all i ; the problem is that we cannot

be sure a priori that $d(c, X) \geq M$.

To achieve this, first define $\varepsilon = \min\{f(y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq p\}$.

We may of course assume $\varepsilon > 0$.

X is compact, so we may find $x_1, \dots, x_p \in X$ such that

$$\forall x \in X \exists j \leq p \ d(x, x_j) \leq \varepsilon$$

Let then g be the Katětov extension of f to $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_p\}$.

By the finite injectivity of $\mathbb{U}$, there is $c \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $d(c, y_i) = g(y_i)$ for all $i \leq n$ and $d(c, x_j) = g(x_j) = d(x_j, y_{i_j}) + f(y_{i_j}) \geq M + \varepsilon$ for all $j \leq p$.

Since for all $x \in X$, there is $j \leq p$ such that $d(x, x_j) \leq \varepsilon$, the triangle inequality shows that $d(c, x) \geq d(c, x_j) - d(x_j, x) \geq M$, hence $c \in Y$, which proves that Y is finitely injective.

Suppose now that X is Heine-Borel but not compact, and let

$$Y = \{z \in \mathbb{U} : d(z, X) \geq M\}.$$

As before, we only need to show that Y is finitely injective; to that end, let $y_1, \dots, y_n \in Y$ and $f \in E(\{y_1, \dots, y_n\})$.

Let also $x \in X$ and $m = f(y_1) + d(y_1, x)$.

Since $B(x, M + m) \cap X$ is compact, there exists $c \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $d(c, y_i) = f(y_i)$ for all $i \leq n$, and $d(c, B(x, M + m)) \geq M$.

Then we claim that for all $x' \in X$ we have $d(c, x') \geq M$: if $d(x', x) \leq M + m$ then this is true by definition of c , and if $d(x', x) > M + m$ then one has $d(c, x') \geq d(x, x') - d(c, x)$, so that $d(c, x') > M$ (since $d(c, x) \leq f(y_1) + d(y_1, x) = m$). $\diamond$

From the combination of theorems 3.1 and 3.4, one can easily deduce that:

Corollary 3.5. *There is an isometry φ of $B(0, 1]$ such that no isometry of $\mathbb{U}$ coincides with φ on $B(0, 1]$.*

To derive corollary 3.5 from the previous results, let $\varphi: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U} \setminus B(0, 1[$ be an isometry, and choose $x \notin B(0, 2]$. There exists, because of the homogeneity of $\mathbb{U} \setminus B(0, 1[$, an isometry ψ of $\mathbb{U} \setminus B(0, 1[$ such that $\psi(\varphi(x)) = x$. Thus, composing if necessary φ with ψ , we may suppose that x is a fixed point of φ . But then φ must send the ball of center x and radius 1 (in $\mathbb{U}$) onto the ball of center x and radius 1 (in $\mathbb{U} \setminus B(0, 1]$).

Since by choice of x both balls are the same, we see that $\varphi|_{B(x, 1]}$ is an isometry of $B(x, 1]$, yet theorem 3.1 shows that no isometry of $\mathbb{U}$ can coincide with φ on $B(x, 1]$. $\diamond$

(Using finite injectivity and automatic continuity of Baire measurable morphisms between Polish groups, one can give a direct, if somewhat longer, proof of corollary 3.5).

3.2. Fixed point of isometries.

Here we use the tools introduced above - most notably Katětov maps and the compact injectivity of $\mathbb{U}$ - in order to study some properties of fixed points of elements of $Iso(\mathbb{U})$. If $\varphi \in Iso(\mathbb{U})$, we let $Fix(\varphi)$ denote its set of fixed points.

Since the isometry class of $Fix(\varphi)$ is an invariant of the conjugacy class of φ , one may hope to glean some information about the conjugacy relation by the study of fixed points.

Clemens, quoted by Pestov in [9], conjectured that this invariant was the weakest possible: the exact content of his conjecture was that, if $\varphi \in Iso(\mathbb{U})$, then the set of fixed points of φ is either empty or isometric to $\mathbb{U}$.

This turns out to be false in the general case, as we will see below; this will enable us to provide a lower bound for the complexity of the conjugacy relation.

First, we prove the rather surprising fact that the conjecture holds for all isometries of finite order (and even for isometries with totally bounded orbits); so, studying their fixed points will tell us nothing about, say, conjugacy of isometric involutions.

We wish to attract the attention of the reader to a consequence of the triangle inequality, which, though obvious, is crucial in the following constructions:

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{U} \forall x \in \mathbb{U} \quad d(z, \varphi(z)) \leq d(z, x) + d(z, \varphi(x)).$$

If $\varphi: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ is an isometry, and $x \in \mathbb{U}$, we let $\rho_\varphi(x) = \text{diam } \{\varphi^n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$; when there is no risk of confusion we simply write it $\rho(x)$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{U}$, $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_m\})$, and $z \in \mathbb{U}$. Assume that $\min\{f(x_i)\} \geq 2\rho_\varphi(z) > 0$.*

Then define

$$A = \{1 \leq i \leq m: d(z, x_i) < f(x_i) - \frac{\rho_\varphi(z)}{2}\}, \quad B = \{1 \leq i \leq m: d(z, x_i) > f(x_i) + \frac{\rho_\varphi(z)}{2}\}, \quad \text{and } C = \{1 \leq i \leq m: |d(z, x_i) - f(x_i)| \leq \frac{\rho_\varphi(z)}{2}\}.$$

These equations define a Katětov map on $\{\varphi^n(z)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \cup \{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & - \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad g(\varphi^n(z)) = \frac{\rho_\varphi(z)}{2}, \\ & - \forall i \in A \quad g(x_i) = d(z, x_i) + \frac{\rho_\varphi(z)}{2}, \\ & - \forall i \in B \quad g(x_i) = d(z, x_i) - \frac{\rho_\varphi(z)}{2}, \\ & - \forall i \in C \quad g(x_i) = f(x_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if the orbit of z is totally bounded, there exists $z' \in \mathbb{U}$ with the prescribed distances to $\{\varphi^n(z)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \cup \{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$; notice that $\rho(z') \leq \rho(z)$.

Proof of lemma 3.6.

To simplify notation, we let $\rho = \rho_\varphi(z)$. To check that the above equations define a Katětov map, we begin by checking that g is 1-Lipschitz:

First, we have that $|g(x_i) - g(\varphi^n(z))| = |d(z, x_i) + \alpha - \rho|$, where $|\alpha| \leq \rho$. If $\alpha = \rho$ there is nothing to prove, otherwise it means that $d(z, x_i) \geq f(x_i) - \rho$, so that $d(z, x_i) \geq \rho$, which is enough to show that $|d(z, x_i) + \alpha - \rho| \leq d(z, x_i) = d(\varphi^n(z), x_i)$.

We now let $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and assume w.l.o.g that $|g(x_i) - g(x_j)| = g(x_i) - g(x_j)$; the only non-trivial cases are the following:

- (a) $g(x_i) = d(z, x_i) + \alpha$, $g(x_j) = d(z, x_j) + \beta$, with $\alpha > \beta \geq 0$. Then one must have $g(x_j) = f(x_j)$, and also $g(x_i) \leq f(x_i)$, so that $g(x_i) - g(x_j) \leq f(x_i) - f(x_j) \leq d(x_i, x_j)$.
- (b) $g(x_i) = d(z, x_i) + \alpha$, $g(x_j) = d(z, x_j) - \beta$, $0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq \rho$. Then the definition of g ensures that $g(x_i) \leq f(x_i)$ and $g(x_j) \geq f(x_j)$, so that $g(x_i) - g(x_j) \leq f(x_i) - f(x_j) \leq d(x_i, x_j)$.
- (c) $g(x_i) = d(z, x_i) - \alpha$, $g(x_j) = d(z, x_j) - \beta$, $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$. Then we have $g(x_i) = f(x_i)$, and $g(x_j) \geq f(x_j)$, so $g(x_i) - g(x_j) \leq f(x_i) - f(x_j)$.

We proceed to check the remaining inequalities:

- $g(\varphi^n(z)) + g(\varphi^m(z)) = 2\rho \geq d(\varphi^n(z), \varphi^m(z))$ by definition of ρ ;
- $g(\varphi^n(z)) + g(x_i) = \rho + d(z, x_i) + \alpha$, where $|\alpha| \leq \rho$, so $g(\varphi^n(z)) + g(x_i) \geq d(z, x_i) = d(\varphi^n(z), x_i)$.

The last remaining inequalities to examine are that involving x_i, x_j ; we again break the proof in subcases, of which only two are not trivial:

- (a) $g(x_i) = d(z, x_i) + \alpha$ and $g(x_j) = d(z, x_j) - \beta$, where $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$. Then $g(x_i) = f(x_i)$, and $g(x_j) \geq f(x_j)$, so that $g(x_i) + g(x_j) \geq d(x_i, x_j)$.
- (b) $g(x_i) = d(z, x_i) - \alpha$, $g(x_j) = d(z, x_j) - \beta$: then we have both that $g(x_i) \geq f(x_i)$ and $g(x_j) \geq f(x_j)$, so we are done. $\diamond$

This technical lemma enables us to prove the following result, which is nearly enough to prove that $Fix(\varphi)$ is finitely injective:

Lemma 3.7. *Let φ be an isometry of $\mathbb{U}$ with totally bounded orbits, $x_1, \dots, x_m \in Fix(\varphi)$, $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_m\})$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then one (or both) of the following assertions is true:*

- *There exists $z \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\rho_\varphi(z) \leq \varepsilon$ and $d(z, x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all i*
- *There is $z \in Fix(\varphi)$ such that $|f(x_i) - d(z, x_i)| \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof of lemma 3.7:

Let $x_1, \dots, x_m \in Fix(\varphi)$, $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_m\})$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, which we assume w.l.o.g to be strictly smaller than $\min\{f(x_i) : i = 1 \dots n\}$

We may assume that

$$\gamma = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i) - d(x, x_i)| : x \in Fix(\varphi) \right\} > 0 .$$

Let $x \in \text{Fix}(\varphi)$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i) - d(x, x_i)| \leq \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$.

We let z be any point such that

- $d(z, x) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$;
- $\forall i = 1, \dots, m \ |d(x, x_i) - f(x_i)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \Rightarrow d(z, x_i) = f(x_i)$;
- $\forall i = 1, \dots, m \ d(x, x_i) \geq f(x_i) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \Rightarrow d(z, x_i) = f(x_i) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$;
- $\forall i = 1, \dots, m \ d(x, x_i) \leq f(x_i) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \Rightarrow d(z, x_i) = f(x_i) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

(One checks as above that these equations indeed define a Katětov map; z cannot be a fixed point of φ since it would contradict the definition of γ , or the fact that $\gamma > 0$)

We use lemma 3.6 to build a sequence (z_n) of points of $\mathbb{U}$ such that:

- (0) $z_0 = z$;
- (1) $0 < \rho(z_n) \leq \varepsilon$;
- (2) $\forall p \in \mathbb{Z} \ d(z_{n+1}, \varphi^p(z_n)) = \frac{\rho(z_n)}{2}$;
- (3) $\forall i \in A_n \ d(z_{n+1}, x_i) = d(z_n, x_i) + \frac{\rho(z_n)}{2}$;
- (4) $\forall i \in B_n \ d(z_{n+1}, x_i) = d(z_n, x_i) - \frac{\rho(z_n)}{2}$;
- (5) $\forall i \in C_n \ d(z_{n+1}, x_i) = f(x_i)$.

Suppose the sequence has been constructed up to rank n : since $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}, z_n, f$ satisfy the hypothesis of lemma 3.6, we may find a point z' with the prescribed distances to $\{\varphi^p(z_n)\} \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$. As before, z' cannot be fixed, since it would contradict the definition of γ ; we let $z_{n+1} = z'$, and the other conditions are all ensured by lemma 3.6.

If we do not obtain in finite time a z_n such that $\rho(z_n) \leq \varepsilon$ and $d(z_n, x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all i , then either A_n or B_n is nonempty for all n ; hence (3) and (4) imply that $\sum \rho(z_n)$ converges. Therefore, z_n converges to some fixed point z^∞ .

Necessarily, there was some i such that $|d(z_0, x_i) - f(x_i)| \leq |d(x, x_i) - f(x_i)| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, so $\sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i) - d(z_0, x_i)| \leq \gamma - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$.

By construction, $\sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i) - d(z^\infty, x_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i) - d(z_0, x_i)|$, which contradicts the definition of γ . $\diamond$

This is not quite enough to produce fixed points with prescribed distances to some finite set of fixed points; the following lemma ensures that it is indeed possible:

Lemma 3.8. *Let φ be an isometry of $\mathbb{U}$ with totally bounded orbits, $x \in \mathbb{U}$ be such that $\rho_\varphi(x) \leq 2\varepsilon$, and assume that $\text{Fix}(\varphi) \neq \emptyset$.*

Then there exists $y \in \mathbb{U}$ such that :

- $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \ d(y, \varphi^n(x)) = d(y, x) \leq \varepsilon$
- $\rho_\varphi(y) \leq \varepsilon$.

Proof of lemma 3.8.

Let x, φ be as above; let also

$$E = \{y \in \mathbb{U} : \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \, d(y, \varphi^n(x)) = d(y, x) \text{ and } \rho(y) \leq \varepsilon\}$$

Notice that E is nonempty, since any fixed point of φ belongs to E .

Now let $\alpha = \inf\{d(y, x) : y \in E\}$; we want to prove that $\alpha \leq \varepsilon$. If not, let $\delta > 0$ and pick $y \in E$ such that $d(y, x) < \alpha + \delta$.

Let now $\rho(y) = \beta \leq \varepsilon$; one checks as above that the following map g belongs to $E(\{\varphi^n(x)\} \cup \{y\})$:

$$- \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \, g(\varphi^n(x)) = \max(\varepsilon, d(y, x) - \frac{\beta}{2}).$$

$$- \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \, g(\varphi^n(y)) = \frac{\beta}{2}.$$

Since the orbits of φ are totally bounded, there exists $z \in \mathbb{U}$ with the prescribed distances; consequently $z \in E$, and we see that necessarily $\beta < 2\delta$.

Letting δ go to 0, there are only two cases to consider:

(1) one may find $y \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $d(y, x) = \alpha$ and $0 < \rho(y) \leq \varepsilon$.

As before, we may find z such that

$$- \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \, d(z, \varphi^n(x)) = \max(\varepsilon, d(y, x) - \frac{\rho(y)}{2}).$$

$$- \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \, d(z, \varphi^n(y)) = \frac{\rho(y)}{2}.$$

Notice that $z \in E$, and $d(z, x) < \alpha$, which is absurd.

(2) For all $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ there is a fixed point y_p such that $\alpha \leq d(y_p, x) < \alpha + \frac{1}{p}$.

If so, let p be big enough that $\frac{1}{p} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and consider the following map:

$$- g(y_p) = \frac{1}{p}$$

$$- \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \, g(\varphi^n(x)) = d(y_p, x) - \frac{1}{p}.$$

A direct verification shows that $g \in E(\{\varphi^n(x)\} \cup \{y_p\})$, therefore there is $z \in \mathbb{U}$ with the desired distances; to conclude, notice again that $z \in E$ and $d(z, x) < \alpha$. $\diamond$

We have finally done enough to obtain the following result:

Theorem 3.9. *If $\varphi: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ is an isometry whose orbits are totally bounded, and $\text{Fix}(\varphi)$ is nonempty, then $\text{Fix}(\varphi)$ is isometric to $\mathbb{U}$.*

Proof. Recall that a nonempty metric space X is said to have the *approximate extension property* iff

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \, \forall f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}) \, \forall \varepsilon > 0 \, \exists z \in X \, |d(z, x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

It is a classical result that, up to isometry, $\mathbb{U}$ is the only complete, nonempty, separable metric space with the approximate extension property. So, to prove Theorem 3.9, it is enough to prove that $\text{Fix}(\varphi)$ has the approximate extension property.

To prove this, notice first that lemma 3.8 implies that, for all $x \in X$ such that $\rho_\varphi(x) \leq \varepsilon$, there is a fixed point y such that $d(y, x) \leq 2\varepsilon$.

Let now $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \text{Fix}(\varphi)$, $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$, and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Lemma 3.7 tells us that :

- there exists a point z such that $\rho_\varphi(z) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and $d(z, x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all $i = 1 \dots n$, or
- there exists $z \in \text{Fix}(\varphi)$ such that $|d(z, x_i) - f(x_i)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

In the second case, we have what we wanted; so suppose we are dealing with the first case, and pick any fixed point y such that $d(y, z) \leq \varepsilon$. Then $y \in \text{Fix}(\varphi)$, and $|d(y, x_i) - f(x_i)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. $\diamond$

It turns out that the situation is very different when it comes to studying isometries with non totally bounded orbits; one may still prove, using the same methods as above, that if φ is an isometry with a fixed point x , then on any sphere S centered in x and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $z \in S$ such that $d(z, \varphi(z)) \leq \varepsilon$. This is not enough to ensure the existence of other fixed points than x .

Theorem 3.10. *Let X be a Polish metric space.*

There exists an isometric copy $X' \subset \mathbb{U}$ of X , and an isometry φ of $\mathbb{U}$, such that $\text{Fix}(\varphi) = X'$.

Proof .

We may of course assume that $X \neq \emptyset$.

We first need a few definitions: if X is a metric space, we denote by $E(X, \omega, \mathbb{Q})$ the set of functions $f \in E(X, \omega)$ which take rational values on their support (This set is countable if X is).

Also, if $X_0 \subset X$ are two countable metric spaces, and φ is an isometry of X , we want to find a condition on (X, X_0, φ) which expresses the idea that

" φ fixes all the points of X_0 , and for each $x \in X \setminus X_0$, $\varphi^n(x)$ gets to be as far away from x as possible". The following definition is a possible way to translate this naive idea into formal mathematical language:

We say that (X, X_0, φ) has property $(*)$ if:

- $\forall x \in X_0 \ \varphi(x) = x$.
- $\forall x_1, x_2 \in X \ \liminf_{|p| \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_1, \varphi^p(x_2)) \geq d(x_1, X_0) + d(x_2, X_0)$.

The following lemma, which shows that this property is suitable for an inductive construction similar to Katětov's, is the core of the proof:

Lemma 3.11. *Let (X, X_0, φ) have property $(*)$.*

Then there exists a countable metric space X' and an isometry φ' of X' such that :

- X embeds in X' , and φ' extends φ .
- $\forall f \in E(X, \omega, \mathbb{Q}) \ \exists x' \in X' \ \forall x \in X \ d(x', x) = f(x)$.
- (X', X_0, φ_f) has property $(*)$ (identifying X_0 to its image via the isometric embedding of X in X').

Admit this lemma for a moment; now, let X_0 be any dense countable subset of X , and $\varphi_0 = id_{X_0}$. Then (X_0, X_0, φ_0) has property (*), so lemma 3.11 shows that we may define inductively countable metric spaces X_i and isometries $\varphi_i: X_i \rightarrow X_i$ such that:

- X_i embeds isometrically in X_{i+1} , φ_{i+1} extends φ_i ;
- (X_i, X_0, φ_i) has property (*);
- $\forall f \in E(X_i, \omega, \mathbb{Q}) \exists z \in X_{i+1} \forall x \in X_i d(z, x) = f(x)$.

Let Y denote the completion of $\cup X_i$, and φ be the extension to Y of the map defined by $\varphi(x) = \varphi_i(x)$ for all $x \in X_i$.

By construction, Y has the approximate extension property; since Y is complete and nonempty, this shows that Y is isometric to $\mathbb{U}$.

The construction also ensures that all points of X_0 are fixed points of φ , and $\liminf_{|p| \rightarrow +\infty} d(y_1, \varphi^p(y_2)) \geq d(y_1, X_0) + d(y_2, X_0)$ for all $y_1, y_2 \in Y$. Therefore, $Fix(\varphi)$ is the closure of X_0 in $\mathbb{U}$; hence it is isometric to the completion of X_0 , so it is isometric to X . $\diamond$

Proof of Lemma 3.11.

First, let $f \in E(X, \omega, \mathbb{Q})$; we let $X(f) = X \cup \{y_i^f\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and define a distance on $X(f)$, which extends the distance on X , by:

$$\begin{aligned} -d(x, y_i^f) &= f(\varphi^{-i}(x)); \\ -d(y_i^f, y_j^f) &= \inf_{x \in X} (d(y_i^f, x) + d(y_j^f, x)). \end{aligned}$$

(In other words, $X(f)$ is the metric amalgam of the spaces $X \cup \{f \circ \varphi^i\}$ over X .)

Let φ_f be defined by $\varphi_f(y_i^f) = y_{i+1}^f$, $\varphi_f(x) = \varphi(x)$ for $x \in X$.

Notice that, by definition of d , φ_f is an isometry of $X(f)$, which extends φ .

We claim that $(X(f), X_0, \varphi_f)$ has property (*).

To prove this, let $y, y' \in X(f)$; we want to prove that

$$\liminf_{|p| \rightarrow +\infty} d((\varphi_f)^p(y'), y) \geq d(y, X_0) + d(y', X_0).$$

If both y and y' are in X , there is nothing to prove. Two cases remain:

(1) $y \in X$, $y' = y_j^f$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $j = 0$. By definition, we know that

$$d((\varphi_f)^p(y_0^f), y) = f(\varphi^{-p}(y)) = \min_{i=1 \dots n} (f(x_i) + d(y, \varphi^p(x_i)))$$

for some $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$ (recall that $f \in E(X, \omega, \mathbb{Q})$).

Let $\varepsilon > 0$; for $|p|$ big enough, $d(y, \varphi^p(x_i)) \geq d(y, X_0) + d(x_i, X_0) - \varepsilon$.

We then have $d((\varphi_f)^p(y_0^f), y) \geq \min_{i=1 \dots n} (f(x_i) + d(y, X_0) + d(x_i, X_0) - \varepsilon)$, so $d((\varphi_f)^p(y_0^f), y) \geq d(y, X_0) + \min_{i=1 \dots n} (f(x_i) + d(x_i, X_0)) - \varepsilon$.

Hence $d((\varphi_f)^p(y_0^f), y) \geq d(y, X_0) + d(y_0^f, X_0) - \varepsilon$, and we are done.

(2) $y = y_i^f$ and $y' = y_j^f$; we may assume that $i = 0$.

Then we have $d(\varphi_f^p(y'), y) = \inf_{x \in X} (f(x) + f(\varphi^{-p-i}(x)))$.

We want to prove that

$$\liminf_{|p| \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{x \in X} (f(x) + f(\varphi^{-p}(x))) \geq 2 \inf_{x \in X_0} f(x) .$$

Assume again that f is controlled by $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, choose $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $|p|$ be big enough that $d(x_i, \varphi^p(x_j)) \geq d(x_i, X_0) + d(x_j, X_0) - \varepsilon$ for all i, j .

Then we have, for all $x \in X$:

$$f(x) + f(\varphi^{-p}(x)) = f(x_i) + d(x, x_i) + f(x_j) + d(x, \varphi^p(x_j)) \text{ for some } i, j.$$

Since $d(x, x_i) + d(x, \varphi^p(x_j)) \geq d(x_i, \varphi^p(x_j))$, we see that there is some

$$(i, j) \text{ such that } \inf_{x \in X} (f(x) + f(\varphi^{-p}(x))) = f(x_i) + d(x_i, \varphi^p(x_j)) + f(x_j).$$

We know that $d(x_i, \varphi^p(x_j)) \geq d(x_i, X_0) + d(x_j, X_0) - \varepsilon$, so

$$\inf_{x \in X} (f(x) + f(\varphi^{-p}(x))) \geq f(x_i) + d(x_i, X_0) + d(x_j, X_0) + f(x_j) - \varepsilon \geq 2 \inf_{x \in X_0} f(x) - \varepsilon.$$

This is enough to prove that $(X(f), X_0, \varphi_f)$ has property (*).

Now, let X' denote the metric amalgam of the spaces $X(f)$ over X , where f varies over $E(X, \omega, \mathbb{Q})$. It is countable, and letting $\varphi'(x) = \varphi_f(x)$ for all $X \in X^f$ defines an isometry of X' which extends φ .

If $f \neq g \in E(X, \omega, \mathbb{Q})$, let $k_f(g)$ denote the Katětov of g to $X(f)$; by definition, the metric amalgam of $X(f)$ and $X(g)$ over X is exactly the space $(X(f))(k_f(g))$, which is enough to show that (X', X_0, φ) has property (*). $\diamond$

This construction has an additional interest, since it provides a lower bound for the complexity of conjugacy between isometries of $\mathbb{U}$. Indeed, we may endow any countable graph with the graph distance, turning it into a countable Polish metric space; two graphs are isomorphic if, and only if, the corresponding metric spaces are isometric.

Now, let X and X' denote two isometric countable Polish metric spaces. Let $X_\infty = \cup X_i$ and $X'_\infty = \cup X'_i$ denote the spaces obtained by our construction, and $\varphi_\infty, \varphi'_\infty$ the corresponding isometries. It is not hard to see that the isometry between X and X' extends to an isometry $\psi: X_\infty \rightarrow X'_\infty$ such that $\psi \circ \varphi_\infty = \varphi'_\infty \circ \psi$.

Since the completions of X_∞ and X'_∞ are both isometric to $\mathbb{U}$, this means that we may, reasoning as in [3], build a Borel map $\Psi: \text{GRAPH} \rightarrow \text{Iso}(\mathbb{U})$ such that any graph G is isometric to $\text{Fix}(\Psi(G))$, and $\Psi(G)$ and $\Psi(G')$ are conjugate if G and G' are isomorphic.

Conversely, assume that there is $\varphi \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{U})$ such that $\varphi \circ \Psi(G) = \Psi(G') \circ \varphi$; this implies that $\varphi(\text{Fix}(\Psi(G))) = \text{Fix}(\Psi(G'))$, and this proves that G and G' are isometric. We have just proved the following result:

Theorem 3.12. *Graph isomorphism Borel reduces to conjugacy of isometries in $\mathbb{U}$.*

4. TRYING TO EXTEND FINITE HOMOGENEITY

4.1. Reformulating the problem.

The remainder of this article will be devoted to proving the following result:

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be a Polish metric space. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (a) X is compact.
- (b) If $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ are both isometric to X and $\varphi: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is an isometry, then there exists $\tilde{\varphi} \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{U})$ which extends φ .
- (c) If $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ are both isometric to X , then there exists $\varphi \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{U})$ such that $\varphi(X_1) = X_2$.
- (d) If $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ is isometric to X and $f \in E(X_1)$, there exists $z \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $d(z, x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in X_1$.

(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) is well-known, as explained in the introduction (see [5] for a proof); (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) is trivial.

To see that (c) $\Rightarrow$ (d), let X have property (c) and be embedded in $\mathbb{U}$, and $f \in E(X)$; the metric space $X_f = X \cup \{f\}$ embeds in $\mathbb{U}$, so that there exists an isometric copy $Y = X' \cup \{z\} \subset \mathbb{U}$ of X_f , where X' is an isometric copy of X .

Notice that, since there exists a copy of X which is g -embedded in $\mathbb{U}$, and all isometric copies of X are isometric by an isometry of the whole space, all the isometric copies of X are necessarily g -embedded in $\mathbb{U}$.

Let now φ be the isometry from X to X' which sends any point x to its copy in X' ; we have, by definition, $d(z, \varphi(x)) = f(x)$. Pick now an isometry ψ of $\mathbb{U}$ which maps $X' \rightarrow X$; then $d(\psi(z), \psi \circ \varphi(x)) = f(x)$. Consequently, if we let ρ be an isometry of $\mathbb{U}$ which extends $(\psi \circ \varphi)^{-1}$ then we have for all $x \in X$:

$$d(\rho(\psi(z)), x) = d(\psi(z), \rho^{-1}(x)) = d(\psi(z), \psi \circ \varphi(x)) = d(z, \varphi(x)) = f(x).$$

So $\rho(\psi(z)) = z'$ is such that $d(z', x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in X$, and X has property (d).

It only remains to show that (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a); this turns out to be the hard part of the proof.

If $X \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ is closed, define $\Phi^X: \mathbb{U} \rightarrow E(X)$ by $\Phi^X(z)(x) = d(z, x)$.

Notice that Φ^X is 1-Lipschitzian. Property (d) in theorem 4.1 is equivalent to Φ^{X_1} being onto for any isometric copy $X_1 \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ of X ; but $\Phi^{X_1}(\mathbb{U})$ is necessarily separable since $\mathbb{U}$ is, so we see that for X to have property (d) it is necessary that $E(X)$ be separable.

The next logical step is to determine the Polish metric spaces X such that $E(X)$ is separable.

4.2. Compactly tentacular spaces.

One can rather easily narrow the study:

Proposition 4.2. *If X is Polish and not Heine-Borel, then $E(X)$ is not separable.*

Proof: The hypothesis tells us that there exists $M, \varepsilon > 0$ and $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\forall i \neq j \quad \varepsilon \leq d(x_i, x_j) \leq M.$$

If $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, define $f_A : \{x_i\}_{i \geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f_A(x_i) = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } i \notin A \\ M + \varepsilon & \text{else} \end{cases}$.

It is easy to check that for all $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, $f_A \in E(\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0})$, and if $A \neq B$ one has $d(f_A, f_B) = \varepsilon$ (where d is the distance on $E(\{x_i\})$).

Hence $E(\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0})$ is not separable; since it is isometric to a subspace of $E(X)$ (see section 2), this concludes the proof. $\diamond$

So we know now that, to have property (d) of theorem 4.1, a metric space X has to be Heine-Borel; at this point, one could hope that either only compact sets are such that $E(X)$ is separable, or all Heine-Borel Polish spaces have this property. Unfortunately, the situation is not quite so simple, as the following two examples show:

Example 4.3. *If $\mathbb{N}$ is endowed with its usual distance, then $E(\mathbb{N}) = \overline{E(\mathbb{N}, \omega)}$.*

Indeed, let $f \in E(\mathbb{N})$; then one has for all n that $|f(n) - n| \leq f(0)$, and also $f(n+1) \leq f(n) + 1$. This last inequality can be rewritten as $f(n+1) - (n+1) \leq f(n) - n$.

So $f(n) - n$ converges to some $a \in \mathbb{R}$; let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose M big enough that $n \geq M \Rightarrow |f(n) - n - a| \leq \varepsilon$.

Then, for all $n \geq M$, one has

$$0 \leq f(M) + n - M - f(n) = (f(M) - M - a) - (f(n) - n - a) \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

If one lets, for all i , f_i be the Katětov extension of $f|_{[0, i]}$, then

$f_i \in E(\mathbb{N}, \omega)$ and we have just shown that (f_i) converges uniformly to f .

Replacing the sequence $f(n) - n$ by the function $f(x) - x$, one would have obtained the same result for any subset of $\mathbb{R}$ (endowed with its usual metric, of course); actually, one may use the same method to prove that $E(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_1)$ is separable for all n .

The situation turns out to be very different when $\mathbb{R}^n$ is endowed with other norms, as the following example shows.

Example 4.4. If $n \geq 2$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ is endowed with the euclidian distance, then $E(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is not separable.

We only need to prove this for $n = 2$, since $E(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|_2)$ is isometric to a closed subset of $E(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_2)$ for any $n \geq 2$.

Remark first that it is easy to build a sequence (x_i) of points in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$d(x_{i+1}, 0) \geq d(x_i, 0) + 1$ for all i , and

$$\forall i > j \in \mathbb{N}, d(x_i, 0) \leq d(x_i, x_j) + d(x_j, 0) - 1 \quad (*)$$

One can assume that $d(x_i, 0) \geq 1$ for all i ; now define $f: \{x_i\}_{i \geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f(x_i) = d(x_i, 0)$. Obviously, f is a Katětov map.

If $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is nonempty, define $f_A: \{x_i\}_{i \geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the Katětov extension of $f|_{\{x_i: i \in A\}}$.

Suppose now that $A \neq B$ are subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, let m be the smallest element of $A \Delta B$, and assume without loss of generality that $m \in A$.

Then one has $f_A(x_m) = d(x_m, 0)$, and $f_B(x_m) = d(x_m, x_i) + d(x_i, 0)$ for some $i \neq m$.

If $i < m$, then $(*)$ shows that $f_B(x_m) - f_A(x_m) \geq 1$; if $i > m$, then $f_B(x_m) - f_A(x_m) \geq d(x_i, 0) - d(x_m, 0) \geq 1$.

In any case, one obtains $d(f_A, f_B) \geq 1$ for any $A \neq B$, which shows that $E(\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0})$ is not separable.

Hence $E(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|_2)$ cannot be separable either.

These two examples have something in common: in the first case, the fact that all points lie on a line gives us that $\overline{E(X, \omega)} = E(X)$; in the second case, the existence of an infinite sequence of points on which the triangle inequality is always far from being an equality enables us to prove that $E(X)$ is not separable.

It turns out that this is a general situation, and we can now characterize the spaces X such that $E(X)$ is separable:

Let (X, d) be a nonempty metric space.

For $\varepsilon > 0$, a sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in X is said to be ε -good-inline if for every $r \geq 0$ we have $\sum_{i=0}^r d(u_i, u_{i+1}) \leq d(u_0, u_{r+1}) + \varepsilon$.

A sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in X is said to be inline if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N \geq 0$ such that $(u_{n+N})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is ε -good-inline.

Theorem 4.5. Let X be a Polish metric space.

The following assertions are equivalent:

(a) $E(X) = \overline{E(X, \omega)}$

(b) $E(X)$ is separable

(c) X is Heine-Borel and

$\forall \delta > 0 \forall (x_n) \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \forall n \geq N \exists i \leq N d(x_0, x_n) \geq d(x_0, x_i) + d(x_i, x_n) - \delta$.

(d) Any sequence of points of X admits an inline subsequence.

Proof of Theorem 4.5.

(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) is obvious; the proof of $\neg(c) \Rightarrow \neg(b)$ is similar to Example 4.4, so we leave it as an exercise for the interested reader.

To see that (c) $\Rightarrow$ (d), one simply needs to repeatedly apply the pigeon-hole principle. It remains to prove that (d) $\Rightarrow$ (a).

For that, suppose by contradiction that some Polish metric space X is Heine-Borel, has property (d), but not property (a).

Choose then $f \in E(X) \setminus \overline{E(X, \omega)}$, and let f_n be the Katětov extension to X of $f|_{B(z, n]}$ (where z is some point in X).

Then for all $x \in X$, $n \leq m$ one has $f_n(x) \geq f_m(x) \geq f(x)$; hence the sequence $(d(f_n, f))$ converges to some $a \geq 0$.

Notice that, since closed balls in X are compact, each f_n is in $\overline{E(X, \omega)}$: this proves that $a > 0$, and one has $d(f_n, f) \geq a$ for all n .

One can then build inductively a sequence $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ of elements of X , such that for all $i \geq 1$ $d(x_{i+1}, z) \geq d(x_i, z) + 1$ and

$$f(x_i) \leq \min_{j < i} \{f(x_j) + d(x_i, x_j)\} - \frac{3a}{4}$$

Since $|f(x_i) - d(x_i, z)| \leq f(z)$, one can assume, up to some extraction, that $(f(x_i) - d(x_i, z))$ converges to some $l \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now, let $\delta = \frac{a}{4}$. (d) tells us that we can extract from the sequence (x_i) a subsequence $x_{\varphi(i)}$ having the additional property that

$$\forall 1 \leq j \leq i, \quad d(z, x_{\varphi(i)}) \geq d(z, x_{\varphi(j)}) + d(x_{\varphi(i)}, x_{\varphi(j)}) - \delta$$

To simplify notation, we again call that subsequence (x_i) .

Choose then $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq M \Rightarrow |f(x_n) - d(x_n, z) - l| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$.

For all $n \geq M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_M) + d(x_M, x_n) - f(x_n) &= (f(x_M) - d(x_M, z) - l) - (f(x_n) - d(x_n, z) - l) \\ &\quad + (d(x_M, z) - d(x_n, z) + d(x_M, x_n)), \text{ so that} \\ f(x_M) + d(x_M, x_n) - f(x_n) &\leq 2\delta = \frac{a}{2} < \frac{3a}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the definition of the sequence (x_i) , and we are done. $\diamond$

For lack of a better word, we will call (for now...) a non totally bounded metric space X such that $\overline{E(X, \omega)} = E(X)$ a *compactly tentacular* metric space.

It is worth pointing out that in the course of the proof of theorem 4.5, we proved that, if X is compactly tentacular and $f \in E(X)$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact $K \subseteq X$ such that $d(f, k(f|_K)) < \varepsilon$.

The following fact is worth stating:

Theorem 4.6. *$QL = \{F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{U}) : F \text{ is compactly tentacular}\}$ is a Borel subset of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{U})$, endowed with the Effros Borel structure.*

4.3. End of the proof of theorem 4.1.

Now we are ready to finish the proof of theorem 4.1; we need to study the case of compactly tentacular spaces.

Let X be a compactly tentacular metric space; we wish to build a copy $X' \subset \mathbb{U}$ of X such that $\Phi^{X'}(\mathbb{U}) \neq E(X')$.

So, it is natural to try to build an isometric copy $X_1 \subset \mathbb{U}$ of X such that $\Phi^{X_1}(\mathbb{U})$ is as small as possible.

To do this, we need a definition:

If X is a metric space and $\varepsilon > 0$, we say that $f \in E(X)$ is ε -saturated if there exists a compact $K \subset X$ such that, for any $g \in E(X)$, $g|_K = f|_K \Rightarrow d(f, g) \leq \varepsilon$. For convenience, we say that such a compact K witnesses the fact that f is ε -saturated.

We say that f is saturated if it is ε -saturated for all $\varepsilon > 0$; simple examples of saturated maps are given by maps of the form $z \mapsto d(x, z)$, where $x \in X$ (since for any $\varepsilon > 0$ one can take $K = \{x\}$).

A more interesting example is the following: let $X = \mathbb{N}$, and $f \in E(\mathbb{N})$ be such that $f(0) = f(1) = 1/2$.

Then the triangle inequality implies that $f(n+2) = n + 3/2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which shows that f is saturated. In other words, such a map is necessarily contained in $\Phi^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbb{U})$ whenever $\mathbb{N}$ is embedded in $\mathbb{U}$.

It is easy to see that if X is a noncompact metric space there is $f \in E(X)$ which is not saturated. Thus, the following proposition is enough to finish the proof of Theorem 4.1:

Proposition 4.7. *Let X be a compactly tentacular space. There exists an isometric copy $X' \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ of X such that $\Phi^{X'}(z)$ is saturated for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$.*

We will use in the proof of Proposition 4.7 some simple properties of ε -saturated maps on compactly tentacular metric spaces, which we regroup in the following technical lemma in the hope of making the proof itself clearer:

Lemma 4.8. *Let X be a compactly tentacular Polish metric space.*

(1) *If $\varepsilon > 0$ and $f \in E(X)$ is not ε -saturated, then for any compact $K \subseteq X$ there is $g \in E(X)$ such that $g|_K = f|_K$ and $g(x) > f(x) - \varepsilon$ for some $x \in X$.*

(2) *If $f \in E(X)$ is saturated, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact $K \subseteq X$ such that*

$$\exists M \forall x \in X \ d(x, K) \geq M \Rightarrow \exists z \in K \ f(z) + f(x) \leq d(z, x) + \varepsilon.$$

(3) *Let $f_n \in E(X)$ be ε_n -saturated maps such that :*

- *For any n there exists a compact K_n which witnesses the fact that f_n is $2\varepsilon_n$ -saturated, and such that $m \geq n \Rightarrow f_m|_{K_n} = f_n|_{K_n}$.*

- $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$.

- $\cup K_n = X$

Then f_n converges uniformly to a saturated Katětov map f .

Proof of Lemma 4.8

(1) Since X is compactly tentacular, there exists a compact set L such that $d(k(f|_L), f) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$; we may assume that $K \supseteq L$.

Since f is not ε -saturated, we know that there is $g \in E(X)$ such that $g|_K = f|_K$ and $d(g, f) > \varepsilon$.

Thus there exists x such that $|f(x) - g(x)| > \varepsilon$.

Yet, by definition of a Katětov extension, we necessarily have that $g \leq k(f|_K) \leq k(f|_L) \leq f + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, so that $|f(x) - g(x)| > \varepsilon$ is only possible if $f(x) - g(x) > \varepsilon$, i.e. $g(x) < f(x) - \varepsilon$.

(2) Let $f, \varepsilon > 0$ be as above, and K be a compact witnessing the fact that f is $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ -saturated.

Now, pick any x such that $d(x, K) \geq M = 2 \max\{f(x) : x \in K\} + \varepsilon$.

Suppose by contradiction that one has $f(x) + f(z) > d(z, x) + \varepsilon$ for any $z \in K$, and let g be defined on $K \cup \{x\}$ by $g|_K = f|_K$ and $g(x) = f(x) - \varepsilon$.

Then for any $z \in K$ we have

$$|g(x) - g(z)| = |f(x) - f(z) - \varepsilon| = f(x) - f(z) - \varepsilon \leq f(x) - f(z) \leq d(x, z).$$

Also, for any $z \in K$ one has $g(x) + g(z) = f(x) + f(z) - \varepsilon > d(z, x)$.

Finally, it is obvious that $|g(z_1) - g(z_2)| = |f(z_1) - f(z_2)| \leq d(z_1, z_2) \leq f(z_1) + f(z_2) = g(z_1) + g(z_2)$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in K$.

Consequently, the Katětov extension $k(g)$ of g to X_p is such that $k(g)|_K = f|_K$ and $d(f, k(g)) \geq \varepsilon$, which contradicts the definition of K .

(3) Let X, f_n, ε_n and K_n be as in the statement of 4.8(3).

Then (f_n) obviously converges pointwise to some Katětov map f , and we have to show that f is saturated and the convergence is actually uniform.

To that end, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose N such that $2\varepsilon_N \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

Then we have, for all $n \geq N$, that $f_n|_{K_N} = f_N|_{K_N}$, which by definition of K_N implies that $d(f_n, f_N) \leq 2\varepsilon_N$. But then one gets $d(f_n, f_m) \leq \varepsilon$ for any $n, m \geq N$, which shows that (f_n) is Cauchy, which proves that the convergence is uniform.

To show that f is saturated, let again $\varepsilon > 0$ and find n such that $2\varepsilon_n \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $d(f_n, f) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

Then any Katětov map g such that $g|_{K_n} = f|_{K_n} = f_n|_{K_n}$ has to satisfy $d(f, g) \leq d(f, f_n) + d(f_n, g) \leq \varepsilon$. $\diamond$

Proof of Proposition 4.7.

The method of proof we intend to use is classical (cf section 2): we let $X_0 = X$, and define inductively metric spaces X_i such that $X_{i+1} \supseteq X_i$,

$\cup X_i$ is finitely injective, and $\cup X_i$ has the desired property; then its completion will be isometric to $\mathbb{U}$ and satisfy the result of the theorem. So, let as promised $X_0 = X$, and define

$$X_{i+1} = \{f \in E(X_i) : f|_{X_0} \text{ is saturated} \}.$$

(This makes sense since, as in section 2, we may assume, using the Kuratowski map, that $X_i \subseteq X_{i+1}$).

As usual, we let Y denote the completion of $\cup X_i$, and need only prove that Y is finitely injective to conclude the proof.

For that, it is enough to show that $\cup X_i$ is finitely injective; take then $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq X_p$ (for some $p \geq 0$) and $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$.

We only need to find a map $f \in E(X_p)$ which takes the prescribed values on $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and whose restriction to X_0 is saturated, since this will belong to X_{p+1} and have the desired distances to $x_1, \dots, x_n$.

To achieve this, we use the following lemma:

Lemma 4.9. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X_p$, $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$.*

Let also $f' \in E(X_p)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $f'(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all i , and $f'|_{X_0}$ is not ε -saturated.

Then, for any compact $K_0 \subset X_p$, there exists $g \in E(X_p)$ such that

$$\forall i = 1 \dots n \ g(x_i) = f(x_i), \ g|_{K_0} = f'|_{K_0} \text{ and } \exists x \in X_p \setminus K_0 \ g(x) \leq f'(x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (*)$$

Proof of lemma 4.9

To simplify notation below, fix some point $z_0 \in K_0$.

Since f' is not ε -saturated, we can find $y_1 \notin K_0$ such that $f'(y_1) + f'(z) > d(y, z) + \varepsilon$ for all $z \in K_0$. Letting $K_1 = B(z_0, 2d(z, y_1))$ we can apply the same process and find y_2 , and so on.

It is not hard to see that one can indefinitely continue this process, and one can thus build a sequence (y_n) such that $d(y_n, z_0) \rightarrow +\infty$, an increasing sequence of compact sets (K_i) such that $\cup K_i = X$, and

$$\forall i \geq 1 \ \forall z \in K_{i-1} \ f'(y_i) + f'(z) > d(y_i, z) + \varepsilon.$$

Claim: If one cannot find a map g as in $(*)$, then there exists I such that

$$\forall i \geq I \ \exists k_i \ f'(y_i) + f(x_{k_i}) < d(x_{k_i}, y_i) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (**)$$

Proof: By contradiction, assume that for all I there exists $i \geq I$ such that $f'(y_i) + f(x_k) \geq d(x_k, y_i) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $k = 1 \dots n$.

Choose I such that $d(y_I, z_0) \geq \max\{f'(z) : z \in K_0\} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, $f'(y_i) \geq f'(z)$ for all $z \in K_0$ and $i \geq I$, $K_I \supseteq B(z_0, 2\text{diam}(K_0))$, then find $i \geq I$ as above.

Define a map g on $\{x_k\}_{k=1 \dots n} \cup K_0 \cup \{y_i\}$ by $g(y_i) = f'(y_i) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, $g(x) = f'(x)$ elsewhere.

By choice of i and since $f'(y_i) + f'(z) \geq d(y, z) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $z \in K_0$,

we see that g is Katětov, and that its Katětov extension $k(g)$ to X_p is such that $k(g)(x_i) = f(x_i)$, $k(g)|_{K_0} = f'|_{K_0}$ and $k(g)(y_i) \leq f'(y_i) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. This concludes the proof of the claim.

Up to some extraction, we may assume that $k_i = k$ for all $i \geq i$. By definition of X_p , we know that the restriction to X_0 of the map $d(x_k, \cdot)$ is saturated, so lemma 4.8 shows that there exists J such that

$$\forall j > J \exists z \in K_J \quad d(x_k, z) + d(x_k, y_j) \leq d(z, y_j) + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Combining this with (**), we obtain, for $j > \max(I, J)$, that there exists $z \in K_J \subseteq K_{j-1}$ such that $f'(y_j) + f(x_k) + d(x_k, z) \leq d(z, y_j) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. This in turn implies that $f'(y_j) + f'(z) < d(z, y_j) + \varepsilon$, which contradicts the definition of the sequence (y_i) . $\diamond$

We are now ready to move on to the last step of the proof of proposition 4.7:

First, pick $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq X_p$ (for some $p \geq 0$) and $f \in E(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$. We wish to obtain $g \in E(X_p)$ such that $g(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all i , and $g|_{X_0}$ is saturated.

Letting $\varepsilon_0 = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0: k(f)|_{X_0} \text{ is } \varepsilon\text{-saturated}\}$, we only need to deal with the case $\varepsilon_0 > 0$.

We have shown that if $k(f)|_{X_0}$ is not ε -saturated then for any compact $K \subseteq X_p$ we may find $g \in E(X_p)$ such that $g|_K = k(f)|_K$, $g(x_i) = f(x_i)$ and $g(x) \leq k(f)(x) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for some $x \in X_0 \setminus K$.

Let L_0 be a compact set witnessing the fact that $k(f)$ is $2\varepsilon_0$ -saturated, and choose $z_0 \in L_0$; there exists $f_1 \in E(X_p)$ such that $f_1|_{L_0} = k(f)|_{L_0}$, $f_1(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for $i = 1 \dots n$ and $z_1 \in X_0 \setminus L_0$ such that $f_1(z_1) \leq \min\{k(f)(z) + d(z, z_1): z \in L_0\} - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$.

Again, let $\varepsilon_1 = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0: f_1|_{X_0} \text{ is } \varepsilon\text{-saturated}\}$: if $\varepsilon_1 = 0$ we are finished, so assume it is not, let $L_1 \supseteq B(z_0, \text{diam}(L_0) + d(z_0, z_1))$ be a compact set witnessing the fact that f_1 is $2\varepsilon_1$ -saturated and apply the same process as above to $(f_1, L_1, \varepsilon_1)$.

Then we obtain $z_2 \notin L_1$ and $f_2 \in E(X_p)$ such that $f_2(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for $i = 1 \dots n$, $f_2|_{L_1} = f_1|_{L_1}$ and $f_2(z_2) \leq \min\{f_1(z) + d(z, z_2): z \in L_1\} - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}$.

We may iterate this process, thus producing a (finite or infinite) sequence $(f_m) \in E(X_p)$ who has (among others) the property that $f_m(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all m and $i = 1 \dots n$; the process terminates in finite time only if some $f_m|_{X_0}$ is saturated, in which case we have won.

So we may focus on the case where the sequence is infinite: then the construction produces a sequence of ε_m -saturated Katětov maps (f_m) , an increasing and exhaustive sequence of compact sets (L_m) witnessing that f_m is $2\varepsilon_m$ -saturated, and points $z_m \in L_m \setminus L_{m-1}$ such that $f_m(z_m) \leq \min\{f_{m-1}(z) + d(z, z_m): z \in L_{m-1}\} - \frac{\varepsilon_{m-1}}{2}$.

If 0 is a cluster point of (ε_n) , passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may apply lemma 4.8(3) and thus obtain a map $h \in E(X_p)$ such that $h(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for all $i = 1 \dots n$ and $h|_{X_0}$ is saturated.

Therefore, we only need to deal with the case when there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\varepsilon_n \geq 2\alpha$ for all n ; we will show by contradiction that this never happens.

Since the sequence (L_m) is exhaustive, (f_n) converges pointwise to some $h \in E(X_p)$ such that $h(z_m) = f_m(z_m)$ for all m .

Up to some extraction, we may assume, since X is compactly tentacular, that for all m we have

$$d(z_0, z_m) + d(z_m, z_{m+1}) \leq d(z_0, z_{m+1}) + \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Also we know that $h(z_{m+1}) \leq h(z_m) + d(z_m, z_{m+1}) - \alpha$.

The two inequalities combined show that $h(z_{m+1}) - d(z_{m+1}, z_0) \leq h(z_m) - d(z_m, z_0) - \frac{\alpha}{2}$.

This is clearly absurd, since if it were true the sequence $(h(z_m) - d(z_m, z_0))$ would have to be unbounded, whereas we have necessarily $h(z_m) - d(z_m, z_0) \geq -h(z_0)$.

This is enough to conclude the proof. $\diamond$

Remark. If one applies the construction above to $X_0 = (\mathbb{N}, |\cdot|)$, one obtains a countable set $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ such that $d(x_n, x_m) = |n - m|$ for all n, m and

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{U} \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists n, m \in \mathbb{N} \ d(x_n, z) + d(z, x_m) \leq |n - m| + \varepsilon.$$

In particular, $\{x_n\}$ is an isometric copy of $\mathbb{N}$ which is not contained in any isometric copy of $\mathbb{R}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] H.Becker and A.S Kechris, *The Descriptive Set Theory of Polish Group Actions*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series, 232, Cambridge University Press (1996).
- [2] P.J Cameron and A.M Vershik, *Some isometry groups of Urysohn space*
- [3] S. Gao and A.S Kechris, *On the classification of Polish metric spaces up to isometry*, Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc., 766, Amer. Math. Soc. (2003).
- [4] M. Gromov, *Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian spaces*. Birkhauser, pp 78-85(1998).
- [5] G.E Huhunaišvili, *On a property of Uryson's universal metric space*(Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk. USSR (N.S), 101, pp 332-333 (1955).
- [6] M. Katětov, *On universal metric spaces*, Proc. of the 6th Prague Topological Symposium (1986), Frolik (ed). Helderman Verlag Berlin, pp 323-330 (1988).
- [7] A.S Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Springer-Verlag (1995).

- [8] A.S Kechris, *Actions of Polish groups and Classification Problems*, Analysis and Logic, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series, Cambridge University Press (2000).
- [9] V. Pestov, *Dynamics of infinite-dimensional groups and Ramsey-type phenomena*, IMPA (2005).
- [10] P.S Urysohn, *Sur un espace métrique universel*, Bull. Sci. Math 51 (1927), pp 43-64 and 74-96.
- [11] V.V Uspenskij, *On the group of isometries of the Urysohn universal metric space*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae, 31(1) (1990), pp 181-182.
- [12] V.V Uspenskij, *Compactifications of topological groups*, Proc. of the 9th Prague Topological Symposium (2001), pp 331-346.
- [13] V.V Uspenskij *The Urysohn Universal Metric Space is homeomorphic to a Hilbert Space*, Topology Appl. 139 (2004) nr1-3 pp 145-149.
- [14] A.M Vershik, *The universal Urysohn space, Gromov metric triples and random metrics on the natural numbers*, Russ. Math. Surveys, 53(5) (1998), pp 921-928.

Equipe d'Analyse Fonctionnelle, Université Paris 6
Boîte 186, 4 Place Jussieu, Paris Cedex 05, France.
e-mail: melleray@math.jussieu.fr